

REMARKS

Applicants hereby elect, with traverse, to prosecute Group A, which corresponds to newly added claims 21-31, and 35-37 drawn to polypeptides, polynucleotides encoding the polypeptides, vectors, host cells, methods of producing the polypeptides, and methods of treating or preventing a disorder comprising administering the polypeptides. Newly added claims 21-31, and 35-37 replace original claims 1-6, 9-15, and 19, and are drawn to substantially the same invention, but are of a different scope.

Newly added claims 32-34, 41, and 42 are drawn to methods of using the polynucleotides. Newly added claims 38-40 are drawn to methods of using the polypeptides. Applicants submit that newly added claims 32-34, 38-40, 41, and 42 should be examined together with claims 21-31, and 35-37, per the Commissioner's Notice in the Official Gazette of March 26, 1996, entitled "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)" which sets forth the rules, upon allowance of product claims, for rejoinder of process claims covering the same scope of products. Applicants request that claims 32-34, 41, and 42 be rejoined upon allowance of the claims drawn to the polynucleotides and that claims 38-40 be rejoined upon allowance of the claims drawn to the polypeptides.

In addition, in response to the restriction requirement to elect one polypeptide and its encoding polynucleotide, Applicants provisionally elect SEQ ID NO:12 and SEQ ID NO:25, also with traverse. Claim 21, directed to polypeptide sequences, and claim 30, directed to polynucleotide sequences, are written so that the sequences are part of a Markush group. Applicants submit that these Markush groups are proper. Applicants traverse the requirement for election of particular elements within Markush groups (those elements being, respectively, polypeptide sequences, SEQ ID NO:1-13, and polynucleotide sequences, SEQ ID NO:14-26) on the following grounds:

The Examiner's attention is directed to the Patent Office's own requirements for Markush practice, set forth in the 7th edition of the M.P.E.P. (July 1998) at § 803.02 regarding restriction requirements in Markush-type claims:

PRACTICE RE MARKUSH-TYPE CLAIMS

If the members of the Markush group are **sufficiently few in number or so closely related** that a search and examination of the entire claim can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine all claims on the merits, even though they are directed to independent and distinct inventions. In such a case, the examiner will not follow the procedure described below and will not require restriction.

Since the decisions in *In re Weber*, 580 F.2d 455, 198 USPQ 328 (CCPA 1978) and *In re Haas*, 580 F.2d 461, 198 USPQ 334 (CCPA 1978), it is **improper for the Office to refuse to examine that which applicants regard as their invention**, unless the subject matter in a claim lacks unity of invention. *In re Harnish*, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980); and *Ex parte Hozumi*, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984). Broadly, **unity of invention exists where compounds included within a Markush group (1) share a common utility and (2) share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility.**

This subsection deals with Markush-type generic claims which include a plurality of alternatively usable substances or members. In most cases, a recitation by enumeration is used because there is no appropriate or true generic language. A Markush-type claim can include independent and distinct inventions. This is true where two or more of the members are so unrelated and diverse that a prior art reference anticipating the claim with respect to one of the members would not render the claim obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 with respect to the other member(s). In applications containing claims of that nature, **the examiner may require a provisional election of a single species** prior to examination on the merits. The provisional election will be given effect in the event that the Markush-type claim should be found not allowable. Following election, the Markush-type claim will be examined fully with respect to the elected species and further to the extent necessary to determine patentability. If the Markush-type claim is not allowable over the prior art, examination will be limited to the Markush-type claim and claims to the elected species, with claims drawn to species patentably distinct from the elected species held withdrawn from further consideration.

As an example, in the case of an application with a Markush-type claim drawn to the compound C-R, wherein R is a radical selected from the group consisting of A, B, C, D, and E, the examiner may require a provisional election of a single species, CA, CB, CC, CD, or CE. The Markush-type claim would then be examined fully with respect to the elected species and any species considered to be clearly unpatentable over the elected species. If on examination the elected species is found to be anticipated or rendered obvious by prior art, the Markush-type claim and claims to the elected species shall be rejected, and claims to the nonelected species would be held withdrawn from further consideration. As in the prevailing practice, a second action on the rejected claims would be made final.

On the other hand, should no prior art be found that anticipates or renders obvious the elected species, the search of the Markush-type claim will be extended. If prior art is then found that anticipates or renders obvious the Markush-type claim with respect to a nonelected species, the Markush-type claim shall be rejected and claims to the nonelected species held withdrawn from further consideration. The prior art search, however, will not be extended unnecessarily to cover all nonelected species. Should applicant, in response to this rejection of the Markush-type claim, overcome the rejection, as by amending the Markush-type claim to exclude the species anticipated or rendered obvious by the prior art, the amended Markush-type claim will be reexamined. The prior art search will be extended to the extent necessary to determine patentability of the Markush-type claim. In the event prior art is found during the reexamination that anticipates or renders obvious the amended Markush-type claim, the claim will be rejected and the action made final. Amendments submitted after the final rejection further restricting the scope of the claim may be denied entry. [emphasis added]

As can be seen from the above, it is clear that the present Restriction/Election Requirement does not meet the Patent Office's own requirements.

It is improper for the Office to refuse to examine that which applicants regard as their invention, unless the subject matter in a claim lacks unity of invention. The polynucleotides and polypeptides of the instant invention share a common utility in, for example, toxicology studies based on expression profiling.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that, upon searching and examining SEQ ID NO:12 and SEQ ID NO:25 and finding no prior art over which SEQ ID NO:12 and SEQ ID NO:25 can be rejected, the Examiner must extend the search of the Markush-type claims to include the non-elected species. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute non-elected subject matter in subsequent divisional applications.

Applicants believe that no fee is due with this communication. However, if the USPTO determines that a fee is due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 09-0108.

Respectfully submitted,

INCYTE GENOMICS, INC.

Date: October 14, 2002

Jenny Buchbinder
Jenny Buchbinder
Reg. No. 48,588
Direct Dial Telephone: (650) 843-7212

Date: October 14, 2002

Cathleen M. Rocco
Cathleen M. Rocco
Reg. No. 46,172
Direct Dial Telephone: (650) 845-4587

3160 Porter Drive
Palo Alto, California 94304
Phone: (650) 855-0555
Fax: (650) 849-8886

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

Claims 1-20 have been canceled.

Claims 21-42 have been added.